

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/802,641	Applicant(s) LU ET AL.	
	Examiner Justin Krause	Art Unit 3682	

All Participants:

(1) Justin Krause.

(2) Jon Shackelford.

Status of Application: Allowed

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10/18/07

Time: 11:00 am

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

17-20,23-35

Prior art documents discussed:

None


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called Mr. Shackelford to place the application in condition for allowance by way of examiner's amendment. The claims were amended to clarify the terminology used to describe the bearing body, and make the claims consistent with the language used in the specification. The term "bearing insert" has been removed from the claims as there is no antecedent basis for it in the specification. "Bearing insert" has been replaced with -bearing body- which is supported by the specification. The term "durable" was removed from claim 17 to remove a 112-2nd paragraph issue that the term was relative and had no basis for comparison to determine what the definition of "durable" was with regard to the claim.